

REMARKS

Claims 11 and 12 are active. Claims 25 and 26 have been added.

Claims 11 and 12 are each rejected over Shiga, et al., U.S. 4,994,435 and Goyal, et al., U.S. 5,739,086.

Each of claims 11 and 12 as amended requires that the base metal be in the form of a tape that has no rolling texture. This implicitly means that the material of the base metal has no crystal orientation (though the base metal has a high strength). The claims also recite that the Ag layer on the base metal has a rolling texture. This means that the Ag layer formed at least one side of the base metal has the Ag crystals oriented. In other words, the base metal has no rolling texture, while Ag of the Ag layer has a rolling texture.

In contrast, Shiga discloses a substrate of polycrystalline metal or ceramic and a noble metal layer formed on the substrate. The noble metal layer serves to prevent elements of the substrate from entering the superconductor (column 4, lines 12-15). Neither of the substrate nor the noble metal layer apparently is of a material that has no crystal orientation.

Goyal discloses a metal substrate, a Pd layer and an Ag layer epitaxially formed on the metal substrate in this order (column 11, lines 18-21). In Goyal, the metal substrate, as well as the Pd and Ag layers, have crystal orientation (column 5, lines 33-37).

As should be clear from the above, neither of these references teaches, or even suggests, the novel and advantageous claimed combination of a base metal of a material whose crystals are not oriented and an Ag layer thereon of a material whose crystals are oriented.

As compared with an epitaxially formed base material such as that disclosed in Goyal, the present invention is advantageous in that the orientation of the base metal and its deposition process can be dispensed with, leading to production of the base material at a relatively low cost.

Accordingly, each of the independent claims 11 and 12 defines a novel and advantageous structure not shown or suggested in the applied art. Therefore, these claims are patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 11 is also rejected as being unpatentable over Shiga. The Examiner takes the position that the characteristics of the Ag layer is a matter of choice. As discussed above, Shiga does not teach or suggest the novel invention of amended claim 11. Therefore, this rejection is also improper.

Claims 25 and 26 have been added, these being respectively dependent from claims 11 and 12. The dependent claims add a diffusion layer to the basic structure. These claims add further patentability to the invention and also should be allowed.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Dated: October 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant